UNITY.

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION.

VOL. V. *CHICAGO, MARCH 1, 1880.* NO. 1.

"UNITY'S" BIRTHDAY.

With this number *Unity* begins its third year. A very humble little being it still confesses itself; but it believes mightily in its name, its motto and its destiny,—and somewhat in its subscribers and its Publishing Committee. It believes that its face, appearing every other week with news upon it from the Liberal circle round, is welcomed more and more in Western Homes and parishes; that the general work of our churches and Sunday Schools is furthered by it; that without it the communication between our scattered watch-fires would be sadly lessened; in short, that it, or a substitute for it, is already a convenience, a blessing, almost a necessity to our Western Liberal work. Not self-gloriously, but humbly and thankfully it rejoices in its opportunity to carry the name of the Highest, and the inspiration of the watchword "Freedom, Fellowship and Character in Religion" abroad, from home to home and from church-door to church-door.

Not self-gloriously: that name and that watchword are too great for any use but reverence. Besides, *Unity* knows right well how poorly it as yet lays hold upon its opportunity. The poorness is inevitable. Its youth is one reason. The smallness of the band of Western workers in its spirit and faith is another reason. The fact that the main charge of the paper falls upon a very few of this band, to each and all of whom it is the thing too much in hands already over-busied, is another reason. And the further fact that it does not stand for Freedom alone, nor for Fellowship alone, nor for Character alone, in Religion, but for all three of these as a consubstantial Trinity, is still another reason. For some we are too free; for some we are too charitable; we hope that for none we are too "good." Not all, even of our own inner household, seem to fully understand our name and purpose. When they do, we trust they will believe in us, enough to help us to more fully represent them.

Meanwhile, to those who, already so believing, are willing now to help us use this Western mission field, to them we call, *Turn willingness into a deed!* Help us, as papers must be helped, to subscribers. If no more, get one, get two, to join you and us. We say "join you and *us*," because we have no more at stake than you in this work. This next year,—as the last year and the year before,—the whole expenses of the paper, outside of the regular printing and postal bills, will probably fall far within $300.00; of which two hundred go as partial salary to one whose strength-in-weakness is spent solidly on *Unity* and kindred work. Therefore we feel bold to say to one and all our old subscribers,—to brother-ministers especially,—to the well-off congregations in our city churches,—to the little groups that meet in smaller towns,—to strong-hearted Liberals—men or women, in places lonely for one standing for our name and motto,—to business-friends, believing there is market for their wares, if advertised in such a circle as our paper enters,—and further, to the few rich Liberals able and willing to join us in *carrying* our child-missionary till it grows self-supporting,—to one and all of these we feel bold to say, Help *Unity*, Help us!

That by such help the little paper will win an ever-widening opportunity of service, and better use its opportunity, we feel sure. That the day will come when the paper can afford to claim an editor's whole time and business energy, and thus win a power of service more nearly matching its high aims,—this is our dream: in this hope we have started *Unity*. And to this end we go forward into another volume, counting on the generous co-operation of old friends, and hoping to deserve new ones. Without essentially changing our present plans, or form, we hope to increase the importance of our editorial department. Setting apart the first two pages to Editorial Notes, making a separate department of our clippings from the current press, to be in charge of a special exchange editor. Mr. Hosmer will continue to contribute "Scriptures Old and New," at such intervals as his time and our space will permit. The Sunday Schoool Lesson and "Notes from the Field" departments will be continued. And among the probabilities is a series of papers called the "Liberal Preachers of England out of the Pulpit,"—a series like that be-

gun a year ago, upon the living poets and thinkers of America. 1880 is the Channing centennial year, and that fact we shall recognize in more than one way.

And now let all who are glad that *Unity* was born say so promptly in the usual way!

W. G. GANNETT,
JENK. LL. JONES,
For the Publishing Committee.

THE CHURCH AND MORALITY.

WM. F. ALLEN.

It is a well known fact that among all primitive peoples the organized institutions of religion have nothing to do with morality. At this stage of humanity the divine power is conceived simply as *power*, not at all as *goodness;* nay, oftenest as positively malevolent, and always, I think, as jealous and exacting. However limited the sphere or attributes of a deity—confined, as these generally are, to some person, or nation, or locality, or form of action—so far as these extend, the deity requires service and worship from his votaries. A being, therefore, who is conceived as powerful, even if not all-powerful, and as jealous; in whom, with these positive qualities, there is joined no spirit of beneficence, but rather a disposition to work harm—such a deity is simply an object of dread, and acts of worship are designed simply to propitiate. Even the Hebrew religion, which stands upon a far higher ethical plane than any other early religion, proclaims that "the *fear* of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Jehovah was, above all things, "a jealous God."

This propitiation is conceived very simply: the favor of the god is to be won, and his anger deprecated, just like that of men, by gifts. The actions of men in regard to other men are wholly indifferent to him; all that he demands is that he personally shall have his due. If the votary performs punctiliously certain acts of reverence, and gives liberally of the best of his possessions, the god is satisfied. Religion at this stage is worship, and worship consists wholly in ceremony and in sacrifice,—the sacrifice or surrender of whatever is dearest and most precious, even if it be the son of Abraham or the daughter of Jephtha or of Agamemnon. Nay, certain abnormal outgrowths of Christianity have declared that the most acceptable of all sacrifices is that of virtue, as being the most precious of all possessions. For, it must be observed, the *act* of worship, however formal and perfunctory, is all-sufficient; the Thibetian prayer-mill is but an extreme form of this type of worship. The thoughts and motives of the worshipper, as well as his conduct towards his fellow-men, have nothing to do with religion in this its primitive type. Long generations must pass before it can be even dimly conceived that the Lord is not "pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil."

In this type of religion of primitive and barbarous nations, we detect two distinct elements. One of them is the most fundamental and essential of all religious ideas,—the recognition of a power or principle above mere matter, a sense of dependence upon something higher than one's self. This may be regarded as the universal element in religion, the principle which underlies the free religious idea; and upon this element depends the relation of religion to morality. If religion has any influence upon the actions of men, it is through the conviction that we have interests and responsibilities beyond our material surroundings—however we may conceive these interests to be related to us, and these responsibilities to be enforced.

The second of the elements in question is that in which the special conception of these interests and responsibilities among primitive nations consists; and this is that the favor of the unseen power, and even protection against its malevolence, must be bought. This partial and imperfect conception which characterizes primitive nations, has lasted, by a species of survival, down into civilized times, in which—while the deity is not positively regarded as malevolent—there are yet more features of this early belief than one at first realizes. While all men agree in the first of these elements—the recognition of a divine power—most men agree also, more or less fully, in the second element, growing out of a false and distorted notion of the divine power—the belief that its favor must be bought, and its resentment must be bought off. Hence the necessity of sacrifice, and the development of the sacrificial theories of religion.

The idea of sacrifice here described as underlying primitive forms of worship, has very little in common with the spirit of self-sacrifice which is, perhaps, the noblest of virtues. That is the spirit of the philanthropist, patriot, martyr, who readily surrenders earthly good for the sense of right or the benefit of other men, hoping for nothing again. It is a free gift. The sacerdotal idea of sacrifice is a bargain: the worshipper gives something of his possessions or enjoyments, and receives in return favor or protection, or at least freedom from harm.

The history of religion consists very largely in the relation or the respective prominence of these

two elements. Periods of religious exaltation, of active religious feeling, are marked by a strong sense of the reality of divine things, and of the constant and immediate presence of the divine power: every such period is therefore a season of moral renovation. But the sacrificial theory, the theory that the divine favor must be bought by gifts, by the performance of some ceremonial, or the acceptance of some form of belief, is constantly at war with the true spirit of religion; and this theory cares nothing for the life. Hence moral progress is fitful and uncertain, and its relation to church organizations often obscure and puzzling. For the religious spirit is favorable to it, while the ecclesiastical spirit is at best indifferent. But churches and church movements always unite both these elements in more or less harmonious combination; and according as one or the other is uppermost, morality takes a more or less prominent place.

The great religious revivals, which are the most important events of history—and as well the less marked movement of healthy religious development—have in almost every case consisted in bringing into new distinctness and prominence the feeling of a direct and immediate relation to the divine power; in seizing upon the minds of men in an age or a community of formal religion or materialistic life, and giving them the sure reality of something higher. And after every such spiritual revival that has followed more or less speedily a reaction, in which the sacrificial idea, dependence upon forms and creeds, has again come uppermost—in which it has been insisted that the unseen divine power demands something of us besides and even more than righteousness—the performance of some formal acts, the belief in some dogmatic system.

In this way it has come about that every genuine religious movement, when its original form was spent, has given birth to an organization resting upon some form or other of the sacrificial theory. And such an organization, by the very nature of things, is incapable of creating a healthy and vigorous moral life. It exists primarily for other objects, to which the matters of every-day morality are secondary and wholly unessential. It is not, be it observed, that the truest and most upright life is not met with in these organizations; but that this good life is the fruit, not of the special organization under which it has ripened, but of the universal principles of morality and that spirit of devotion which lives in all organizations. That this is so is proved by the fact that we as often meet with men and women of rare moral excellence in one organization, under one form of church government, or in connection with one creed, as with another.

The churches that are built upon the sacrificial theory have as their primary object to propitiate the deity by some forms of worship or of belief. They set out with some scheme of redemption in the future life, in which good actions in the present life do not necessarily have any share; their end is salvation, not morality. It is no cause of wonder, then, nor even of censure, seeing that morality is not their aim, that, regarded purely as organizations, and in the light of their sacrificial theory, they have totally failed as instruments of morality. The claim, of which we have heard so much of late, that the infallible church, or any dogmatic scheme of salvation, is the only and sufficient guarantee for virtue, is, in the light of history, simply puerile.

As already remarked, the question is not whether in any given church we meet with persons of the highest type of character;—if this were the question, every church would be proved to be the true one;—it is whether it has, *as an organization, by its own inherent and sufficient power*, created such character. I think it will appear that the moral efficiency of these churches has been mainly the result of setting aside for a time their sacrificial theories, and resorting to instrumentalities of the same kind that non-ecclesiastical churches use. In other words, the sacrificial theory is not designed to influence the affairs of this life, and the relations of men to one another, but concerns solely the future life, and the uncertain relations to the unseen power. The broadest facts of Christian history give a sufficient answer to the question.

The church of the early ages appears to have been of the simplest and least ecclesiastical type It was a voluntary association of persons who were thoroughly imbued with that genuine sentiment of religion which its founder, more than any other religious teacher, understood how to inculcate. But when the Christian faith had spread and become popular, when it was accepted by princes and forced upon their subjects, this simple early church was remodelled, converted into a church of the ecclesiastical type, its authority resting upon the sacrificial theory, and thus invested with power over the lives and consciences of men.

This revolution in the Christian church was in reality the pagan spirit taking possession of the Christian organization. The pagan religions are, in their very essence and in the most intense form, sacrificial: their rites are directed wholly and exclusively to gaining the favor or deprecating the ill-

will of their deities, and this by acts of worship which have nothing at all to do with right and wrong. They are purely ritual, and this they continued to be in a prevailing degree even after their votaries were far removed from their early ignorance and barbarism. The worship of the Athenians as Paul saw it, even the worship of the Israelites as Jesus knew it, all the religions of the world, mainly consisted in the performance of prescribed rites and ceremonies.

Now, the work of Jesus was in casting all this aside, as unessential, and building his religion directly upon morality. This was something new. Not that his moral precepts were new in themselves; they were familiar enough, most of them, but as dogmas of philosophy, or simple maxims of conduct. Neither must we forget the pre-eminence of the Hebrew prophets in making righteousness the foundation of preaching. But their teachings were past and the best part of them forgotten; and the Hebrew religion was now given over to a dreary formalism. A religious teacher, therefore, who proclaimed distinctly and loudly that religion was no religion if it did not bear fruit in the life, and who at the same time taught a system of morality higher and more perfect than the world had ever known,—the appearance of such a teacher was an epoch in the history of the world; and such a one was Jesus of Nazareth.

But the church of Constantine and Athanasius, of Hildebrand and Bernard, was a very different thing. I would not underrate the greatness of these men, or disparage their work for humanity. It may be that the sacrificial theory was necessary at that stage of history. And at any rate the best work of Hildebrand and Bernard was in resisting the materialism of their age, and making more real the responsibility of men to divine government. In building up the power of the church, they labored also to make men live better lives. This was the period of the life of the church when the ecclesiastical theory and the genuine spirit of religion were in the completest harmony.

But mark the outcome of the ecclesiastical theory after it had fully run its course, three or four hundred years after the reform of Hildebrand. Probably there is no period since the triumph of Christianity when the world was so utterly given over to worldliness as in the fifteenth century; no time when the precepts of Christ had so completely lost their hold upon men's lives; no age of such gross and open sensuality. The most infamous characters of this degraded age were the heads of the church themselves; the class most constantly accused of shameless indecency of life were the clergy, and especially those bodies of clergy who were most exclusively devoted to a life of religion, the monks and nuns. Now, this was at the same time the period of the most entire supremacy of the ecclesiastical system. The church had exercised absolute rule over the beliefs and consciences of men for a thousand years; it had even asserted its authority over the temporal power; it had lived through an age of schism and heresy, and had seen its unity triumphantly restored and the supremacy of its head established more completely than it had ever been; had trampled out all individuality of opinion and brought to nought the moral reforms of Wyclif and Huss, and later of Savonarola; and this ineffable corruption was the result.*

Then came the great moral revolution of the sixteenth century, the greatest fact of history since the Christian era. I say moral revolution, because that was, after all, its leading characteristic—a revolt against the corruption and materialism of the previous age. Like all great religious movements, this consisted essentially in relegating the sacerdotal, ecclesiastical theory to a secondary place, and bringing into fresh prominence the moral government of God. Nor was this confined to the insurgent party; the reformation of the church itself is not the least striking and important event of that age, and the names of Luther and of Loyola stand side by side as the two great leaders of moral regeneration.

The Protestant Reformation, it is true, was not exclusively a moral reform. It had many sides, not all of them praiseworthy; but especially it was an intellectual movement. And because it was, in its most conspicuous features, a dogmatic revolt, it followed that, when the generous ardor of its first years had cooled, and it began to harden into a formal system—when the ecclesiastical idea began to supersede that of universal religious feeling—the shape it took was a dogmatic one. Calvin succeeded Luther.

Thus Christendom was divided in two hostile systems, equally built upon the sacrificial theory—both of them, that is, making it their first aim to propitiate the divine power; and, by some agency other than a good life in this world—the one by submission to an infallible church, the other by the acceptance of a specific creed—to earn salvation in the world to come. Both these theories of religion are, in the true sense of the word, materialistic—that is, they do not recognize the relation of men to God as purely spiritual, but make it consist in something external and formal, of the same type as the Thibetian prayer-mill, even if higher in its type. And when we reflect upon the state of public and business morality at the present day; when we consider that the worst enemies of Christian civilization are bred in the very heart of Christian society, and that the first effect of contact with Christian nations is invariably to corrupt the very savages; when we consider, moreover, that the orthodox theology has had absolute sway during all these centuries,—must it not be confessed that it has failed as completely as the infallible church to redeem society in this world? Both these forms of Christianity have had the fullest opportunities, and the most unlimited power; and we see what they have accomplished.

I would not be understood as under-estimating the moral progress made by society in Christian times,

---

*A writer who weighs his words, says of society at this age that it was "a condition of Christian civilization which outdoes anything that we authentically know of the old heathendoms."—*Edward Peacock, in the Academy, Aug. 16, 1879.*

or the share of the Christian church in effecting this progress. But here three remarks should be made.

In the first place, this progress is often exaggerated. The Greeks and the Romans, even the Egyptians and Babylonians, heathen as they were, were not wholly given over to sinfulness. If they had been, they could never have risen to the height of civilization that they attained. When they were in their best condition, all the virtues which we call Christian flourished among them; and in their time of decay they were bad enough no doubt, but very far from being wholly bad. In their worst estate they still abounded in examples of noble excellencies, and I would almost say that the grossest corruption which is related of them may be matched in any issue of a Chicago morning paper. Further, it should be noted that the worst features of their immorality have been shown by recent scholarship to be after all only survivals from the customs of barbarous life, while the profligacy of New York and Paris is full in the face of nineteen centuries of Christian instruction.

In the next place, whatever the degree of this progress has been, it is an unwarranted assumption to set it wholly to the credit of the one institution, the church. It will be enough to admit, as I do frankly, that during all this period the Christian church has been an active agency for good. That evil has been mixed with the good, and that good has accrued from other causes, must be admitted by any candid person.

But, thirdly, the agency of the churches in civilization has, for the most part, had no connection with their ecclesiastical form or functions, but has consisted in positive and direct moral influence. Every Christian organization, however bound up in forms and creeds, has after all recognized in some degree the special work of its founder, and has aimed at some direct and vital connection with morality. More than this, barren in good works as the fundamental principles of the organization may be in its direct and regular action, we must acknowledge that in an indirect and secondary way these principles may and do act powerfully upon conduct. Ecclesiastical forms and dogmatic creeds are in themselves incapable of producing good actions towards one's fellow-men; but when they undertake, as a secondary object, to promote morality, there is no question that their very rigidity and authoritativeness give them a certain degree of power. We believe that this is not the healthiest and most effective form of appeal to the moral nature; and we do not believe, as is claimed by those who use it, that it is the only form to which the majority of men are amenable; we must at any rate admit that the majority of men are so situated that this is the only one to the influence of which they can be subjected.

The only thorough and systematic attempt at moral control made by any Christian church, is the confessional. In this institution we find a church organization which is founded explicitly upon the sacrificial theory, invested with authority over every action of life; and thus a remarkable connection established between the church and morality. The ideaand the practice of confession are not confined to the Catholic church. Every person, in the course of his life, is called upon to make a confidant and confessor of some person who stands above him either in position or character, and it is our opinion that this spontaneous and sympathetic relation is a far safer and healthier form of confession than that which emanates from the regularly exercised authority of a church. It seems to us Liberals that its periodicity and obligatoriness must deprive it of its highest value, and make it essentially formal and perfunctory. However this may be—and perhaps it is not for us to pass too severe a judgment upon an institution which we know only on the outside—we, at any rate, reject the fundamental principle upon which the Catholic confessional rests. Confession, as we would admit it, is a voluntary act performed to a person in whom we recognize some moral superiority. The confession of the church is an obligatory act, rendered to a person who, in a certain sense, stands in the place of God, and is divinely invested with authority, not only to listen to the penitent, but to absolve his sins. This claim is utterly beyond our comprehension and belief.

This is, however, a part of the sacrificial theory upon which that church is organized; our concern at present is purely with its ethical aspect. I have said that we object to its formality and authoritativeness. It is, moreover, a very dangerous power. It is not a matter of mere belief, but of historical record, that at some times and in some countries the Catholic confessional has been made the instrument of abominable abuses—not merely in private life, but in public relations, when weak and bigoted kings (and still oftener their wives) have allowed themselves to become the tools of crafty priests. Into the vile corruption associated with the confessional, I do not care to inquire; but it is in a great degree to the same institution that we owe such political crimes as the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the persecutions in Bohemia at the beginning of the Thirty Year's War, the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and, in our own day, the French declaration of war in 1870 against Prussia. The confessional is a dangerous thing.

Nevertheless, like all human institutions, its character varies with times and persons. With the corrupt priesthood of the later middle ages, or the intriguing priests of modern courts, the confessional has been a powerful agency of evil. With the devoted body of men who, as a rule, compose the Catholic priesthood at the present day, it may be, and no doubt is, an agency of great good. With the reservation that we totally disbelieve in the theory which it takes for granted, and that we distrust the formality into which it is likely to fall, we must nevertheless admit that in all probability the Catholic confessional of this country is the source of much more good than harm.

No Protestant church has the power, nor probably if it had the power, would it desire or dare to establish such an institution as the confessional. The Protestant clergy, by the theory of their profession, must be satisfied with the occasional confession of their parishoners; and this we believe to

be in the long run a much more salutary form of confession. The Protestant clergy, too, must be admitted to have performed this work, on the whole, well; nor, on the other hand, can they be acquitted of occasional breaches of their delicate trust, or—especially in Scotland and New England formerly—of an overbearing attitude in public affairs, not a whit less dangerous than the priestcraft of the older church. In exercising their spiritual functions in aid of morality, the Protestant minister misses, no doubt, the absolute authority of the priest, as well as the elaborate organism of the confessional for the control of conduct; but he more than makes up for this in the basis of intelligence on which his authority rests. The Protestant churches, starting from belief instead of organization, deriving their authority from intellectual conviction instead of tradition, are enabled to make their creeds an instrument of moral control, all the more effective as being under the direction of reason. Probably no church organization has ever exercised a moral control approaching in power and efficiency that of the Puritan nations of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; and there is no question that, take it all in all, Protestant communities have been and still are far more moral than Catholic communities. The moral force of the Reformation is not yet spent.

It must be confessed, however, that the Protestant creeds have lost their vitality in a far greater degree than the Catholic organization; and as the the principle of authority has weakened, the control exercised by the Protestant churches as such, over the morality of its members, has become exceedingly slight. Of the great defaulters of these late years, most have been active members of Protestant churches; I do not remember a single prominent Catholic. And the notorious Brooklyn cases afford melancholy proof of the utter helplessness of the system, when it comes to dealing with great sins and scandals. The censorship of morals once exercised so vigorously by the Puritan churches, is no longer possible; that is a thing permanently outgrown by modern society. If, therefore, Protestantism would retain its moral predominence, it must place itself frankly upon the Liberal ground, making ethical teaching its principal work, and inculcating morality *for its own sake.* In the field of authority it can never compete with the church of Rome.

"UNITY"—WHAT? HOW?

R. L. H.

"Can two walk together, except they be agreed?"

Dr. Hedge says that "evolution" is a cant word, and seems to mean that it is a word fondly used often without a definite meaning. In that sense may we not say that "unity" is also a cant word? It is very often used now when it is rather hard to be sure what it means in religion. Some times our brethren speak of "signs of unity," when two men of different denominations exchange pulpits, and seem to come to some agreement in theological views. We are assured by other friends of unity that it does not mean unity in opinions at all, but unity in being pleasant to those who disagree with us. It is unity in "agreeing to disagree." That kind of unity seems to exist between those who fight the most. Surely they agree to disagree. But is that worthy to be called unity? M. J. Savage seems to teach that unity must be some unity of opinion; that there will be no unity of character without unity of thought, because "as a man *thinketh*, so is he." A great deal has been said and written recently about some "common ground," on which orthodox and Liberal people may stand. But nobody has pointed out that "common ground" yet. If it could be found, there we could find unity. Is there any one wise enough to see it, and who can show it? If we say that character (another cant word) is the "common ground," we find that goodness of character is only "worthless morality" in the orthodox estimation. G. S. Merriam speaks of "Goodness and something besides," and he puts the emphasis on the "something besides," as being better than goodness. It is "something besides" goodness that seems to many liberals of such importance, though they say often that practical righteousness is the only firm ground of unity, and the "common ground." Even Dr. James Martineau ridicules this "common ground" of righteousness unless it has a personal God in it. Rev. N. M. Mann, of Rochester, N. Y., preached a good sermon on this ground of unity; and in the extract from that sermon quoted in *Unity*, he is reported as stating that unity in character and not in opinion should be sought. That if a man believes in no God at all, but has "clean hands and pure heart," we should "take him by the hand." Now one cannot help asking: Is that the ground of unity, and the only ground on which Mr. Mann would take one by the hand? Does he not associate religiously with any that have grave faults in character? Will he unite only with the clean? Would he spurn from his unity such men as Robert Burns, the great Scotch poet? How clean must a man be in all points of character before Mr. Mann would take him by the hand into his unity? And Rev. O. B. Frothingham says that it is not reasonable to expect all men to have the same purpose and aim in life, "or even the same desire." He says that all men cannot be holy and good, any more than that all men can be poets and musicians.

Now in view of all these different opinions among great liberal men concerning unity, is it not hard for common men to know what is meant by unity—what is the ground of unity—what kind of unity should we reasonably expect, and how is it to be effected or promoted? O that somebody great enough would arise to show plainly what is the common ground on which men can have religious unity!

A great deal has been said about the "Unity of the Spirit." But who can explain what that means? Can men unite in spirit when they disagree about what they call "essentials" and "fundamentals" in religion? One great man's "essentials" are "non-essentials" to another great man.

Mr. Holyoake, quoted in the *Christian Register*, speaks of the opposite platforms of A and B, and

says that there must be some path from the platform of one to the platform of the other before they can ever come to unity. Now, what is that path over which B can go to A, or A can go to B? Is that path anything but human Reason? Is there any way besides reasoning with each other for B and A to get together? If A can show to B that A's views are more in accordance with the facts of Nature, B will unite with A.

How can men be united even "in spirit," about anything, only as they can show each other their errors, and find out and show what are the real facts of nature in matter and mind?

Is there anybody that can explain this phrase—"Religious Unity?" And can anybody tell plainly how to bring it about?

[This editor does not claim to be "wise enough" to answer Mr. Herbert's pungent questions, but ought at least to try,—or get a new name for the paper. There are, of course, different degrees of religious unity. The lowest is "agreeing to disagree." But even this is much better than Mr. Herbert makes it; for "those who *fight* the most" do not yet "surely *agree* to disagree," even though they say so. Agreeing ends the fighting. This degree of "unity," which has partially come, is a great gain. Even though the old religious battles have only given way to religious disputes, and *swords* shortened to *words*,—why that has broken off the bloody point of the weapons, and the dropped *s* has taken a large part of the serpent's hiss out of religion. If "unity" meant no more than the end of religious wars, and this modern agreement of the churches to disagree, it would still name the greatest blessing to mankind. For out of this, in spite of the disputes, have come a deeper justice and broader humanity.

But unity reaches a higher meaning, when out of the disputes rises at length the recognition of law, the perception of *one* process from which all the diversities of nature and differences of sects have come. With the first step battles yielded to disputes; with this second step disputes lose their bitterness. For when men see that all superstitions and bigotry in religion and "grave faults in character" are a natural and necessary part of the one great orderly process from which they themselves have come, they can but grow more charitable. All true liberals have reached this second degree of religious unity. They see that they do stand on "common ground" with the orthodox, even though they care not to enter the tents of orthodoxy and would not be allowed there. They confess the "common ground" of all religions, even if the orthodox do not. They see that they stand on "common ground" even with the worst men, and though they need not take vicious men to their bosoms, they are moved to help them out of vice. They will have a good wish for every upward movement in humanity, in any church or no church. And this sympathy with every upward tendency in others is the "unity of the spirit."

We know and seek no higher religious unity than this. It is doubtful whether mankind will ever agree in opinions; and if they should, in the consequent indifference and stagnation they would soon cease to have any opinions at all. But perhaps they can agree in everything except opinions, as Carlyle said. At any rate we shall be satisfied with justice and humanity. When religious wars shall have vanished with no danger of return; when religious disputes shall have lost their bitterness in a calm philosophy or a larger charity, this paper will not wait for any unanimity of opinions, but will declare its final dividend, and sing its *nunc dimittis*.—EDITOR.]

HEADS AND HEARTS.

CELIA P. WOOLLEY.

I like that latest word from Mr. Savage, "It is not the heart's business to lead the head, but the head's business to lead the heart;" and am far from sharing those apprehensive views of rational religion which discover in it a growing tendency to cold intellectuality. We can never have too much intellectuality. The liberal pulpit can never overestimate its high opportunity and obligation to present to the world the latest investigations of philosophy, science and ethics, and their practical relation to the duties of life. Its relation to the multitude of waiting souls who attend upon its ministrations, is first that of teacher, and afterwards that of friend and comforter. History shows us only too plainly the position the church has occupied in all past ages with regard to the mental growth of the world. The degree in which she has helped on the cause of human progress is exceedingly small compared to the measure of influence she has used against it. It remains for the liberal church of today to decide whether the old order shall be reversed, and religion place itself in the van of civilization, rather than keep up a halting and unwilling pace in the rear. If she is to do this, she must not be afraid to think, nor to bear the consequences of thinking, which at first are quite as apt to be fraught with pain as pleasure. That faith which is determined by a continual prying into the state of one's *feelings*, which persists in a forced and violent exercise of the various faculties of the soul in order to keep itself in a perpetual state of spiritual glow and satisfaction,—is not ours. We do not, or ought not, to pretend that religion concerns the heart more than the head; that the emotions are any higher or more trustworthy incentives than the convictions of reason. Culture is as much a part of true religion as good works. That may sound extravagant, but let it stand, for by culture is meant the perfection of the whole man,—the slow, harmonious development of the head and heart, the former taking such slight precedence as belongs to it by right of its superior skill and sagacity in the time of emergency. If I am in sore trouble or danger, I do not seek the counsel of one who through excessive sympathy shares my doubts and fears, but turn to one of courage and resolution, who can do my thinking for me for a space. The great trials of life

do not pertain more to the affections than to mental strife and perplexity. The heart suffers because the head has blundered, or rejoices because the head approves. There are no safer guides to happiness than sound judgment and good sense.

It is true that, more carefully speaking, most of these distinctions made between head and heart are as unprofitable as they are unnatural. You cannot set one over against the other and decide which is at all times the very best, any more than you can define those subtle mental differences which distinguish the sexes. Each is indispensable to the other, and they work well together, when the head is kept well supplied with its fit nutriment, and the heart not allowed to run riot over domains where it does not belong. Only for the present, and some time to come, I would lay greater stress on the head, as comprising the elements most to be relied upon in the present juncture of thought and affairs.

As liberal religionists, devoted to the "faith of reason," let us not be forever digging up the seeds of our religious affections, to see if they are beginning to sprout. Let us give ourselves time to grow, for, to quote again from Mr. Savage, "emotion is called out by those things that we have long associated with. It is our business to find out what is true, and let the heart come after, and learn to love and venerate and worship the truth."

CHICAGO, Feb. 7, 1880.

THE PERSONALITY OF THE HOLY GHOST.

J. C. LEARNED.

As I was going down by the Moody meetings the other day, I dropped in to listen awhile. One of our well-known city preachers was occupying the hour. He was setting forth an old subject with unusual freshness and force. It was "the sin of unbelief"—the easily-besetting, the unconsciously-lurking, the every-where prevailing, the deadly damning sin, both of the church and of the world. All evils in heaven above, and in the earth below, or in the hells under the earth; evils past, present, or to come, were massed or linked together, and made to spring from and revolve around that little trick or twist or strain of the individual or carnal mind, characterized as unbelief. "Why," said he, "not long ago the pastor of one of our churches, preached on the personality of the Holy Ghost, a doctrine, which of all that can be named should be well-grounded in the heart of Christians; yet at the end of the service he was saddened and shocked by several active and earnest members coming to him and telling him that they didn't believe in any such thing; didn't believe in the personality of the Holy Ghost!" And yet friends, these people professed not only to be Christians but Christians of the evangelical, trinitarian sort.

Although this instance is but another of those straws which come floating out of the fold of orthodoxy, yet in the present transitional stage of belief, it is a phenomenon worth noting. It is not my purpose here, however, to treat the subject of unbelief in general, and I dismiss it, only remarking that whether unbelief be a sin or not may depend somewhat upon the nature of the thing we are asked to believe; and also upon whether we think a man is to be held guilty for rejecting that which is contrary to reason; or, further, whether it is to be held specially praise-worthy to accept religious or any other propositions, on the children's play-principle of "open your mouth and shut your eyes." Has anything been gained by this plan? Indeed, has not this form of taking doctrines so disagreed with the church, that sooner or later all the intelligence and all the fraud-hating strength of the Christian body has been exerted to resist the method, and spit the bitter, distasteful and indigestible morsels out.

Let us consider now, however, what is implied by the acceptance or rejection of the personality of the Holy Ghost. If by the personality of the Holy Ghost be meant the third part of some other person, in other words if the Holy Ghost be but some undivided third of God, then I do not wonder that doubt and difficulty at length utterly destroy the conception.

One person who is a mathematical fraction of another person, may well enough have his personality doubted or denied. On the other hand, if the Holy Ghost is the whole three-thirds of the Godhead setting up under a new name, acting in its own peculiar way; leaving the divine Fatherhood an empty shell, idle and useless in the high heavens; going and coming like a caravan, using Jesus like a showman's agent to herald the present or approaching paraclete, but claiming to have all power of judgment and control in the human heart in the moral universe—here blessing, there blasting, by its arbitrary decree; none the less is reason confounded. This special and exclusive claim of personality tends to extinguish or swallow up all other personalities, human or divine. Every instinct of veneration and love therefore towards the Heavenly Father, the desire duty to honor his Son, and to rescue from destruction one's own hope of moral growth or power of moral choice, resists this notion of the Holy Ghost. This view casts men backward into barbaric terrorism, instead of helping them forward into sympathetic relations with a divine personality. It is this that brings to Mr. Moody wherever he goes, piteous letters, and calls from many people who are agonized with fear lest they have committed "the unpardonable sin" against that dreadful third person of the Trinity—the Holy Ghost.

Almost in our own day we have seen the doctrine of Annihilation grow up and widely spread in the orthodox churches. It was a terrible alternative, but it was the merciful escape from the doctrine of endless torment which so long had held absolute sway. The wicked according to this are not eternally to live to writhe, and weep, and gnash their teeth, to be eaten of worms, parched with thirst, and burned with fire; but they are to be destroyed in hell, and that the end. In like manner to escape the nemesis of the unpardonable sin, men have been led into the sceptical alternative of denying the personality of the Holy Ghost. They have so

revolted at the dreadful consequence to the soul of an ineradicable and never forgiven sin, as finally to disarm the being offended, of all power or judgment or consciousness.

It is easy to see that personality may be taken in two senses; first, as something co-extensive with, and inclusive of a single definite physical organism. This is about all that the unreflective, mean by personality; but when the man passes into the realm of a higher spiritual thought, he is naturally enough compelled to deny this condition and limit of personality to the higher form of spiritual being. In the second sense, therefore, personality transcending any given bounds of place, time or matter, is co-extensive with will and purpose, with mental power, and moral usefulness. To deny that God has bodily organs and a high seat in some far-off part of the universe is not to deny his personality. We have to deny these things in order to affirm his personality in any worthy or effective way. We do not deny the real personality of the Holy Ghost, when we say that it is invisible, formless, and cannot be caught in convenant meetings, and carried about as medicine or merchandise to be dealt out at revivals. We must needs deny these things if we would maintain the sacredness of our conception.

What is the Holy Ghost? It is the Holy Spirit of God. And not personal? Is it some old notion, or is it something new, and strange that we hear that *any* ghost or spirit whatever, is destitute of personality? And has it come to this that finally in orthodoxy men doubt the personality of the Spirit of God himself? My own idea has been that wherever there is intelligence, wherever there is will, wherever there is order, wherever there is design, wherever there is thought, wherever there is goodness, wherever there is love, there is personality. These enter into and constitute the substance of personality. As we find these manifested in the universe of matter and of mind, we say that they proceeded from God, we know no other origin of them, or any better explanation of them than to call them the attributes of the divine personality. Everything we see refers us to something that we do not see. The order and beauty of a rose points us to a larger order and to a more extensive beauty, of which it is a part. Every atom of matter which makes up the physical man refers to a larger quantity of the same outside. His body is, as some one has said, "an epitome of the world he lives in." But how about the spirit, these faculties of reason, thought, judgment, will, and affection, did they begin and will they end with this weak ephemeral, vanishing figure? Do they not also suggest an inexhaustible source and supply beyond? Is not the mind of man an epitome or reflection of the mind of God—of the infinite mind conditioned to earthy times and place? We find the hightest thought working in the lowest organisms, and has not man been fitly called a spark from the divine life, an image and child of the Creative Reason?

OAK PARK, ILL.—A Convention was held at Unity Church Feb. 21st and 22d.

Geo. W. Cooke, of Indianapolis, is about to publish a book entitled "A Study of Emerson," with some thirty chapters on the following subjects: Introduction, Ancestry, Early Life, Ministry, Concord, At Home, Transcendentalism, Stating the New Faith, Social Relations, Lectures and Essays, Growing Fame, In War Time, Recent Years, Home Life, Literary Methods, Literary Opinions, What the Critics Say, Poetry, As a Lecturer, Place Among Thinkers, Theory of Ethics, Moral Conclusions, Views of God, Views of Man, Views of Immortality, Present Attitude Towards Religion, The Tendencies of Thought. The Indianapolis *Herald* publishes in advance the chapter on Emerson's "Attitude Towards Religion," and from it we take the following paragraph:

"Emerson is irresistibly attracted and inspired by religion, but he is the champion of no special faith. It is the universal that attracts him; the unity under all the many forms. It is no incoming of any external influence that he observes, no supernatural he delights in. It is the natural unfolding and perfecting of what is involved in the very constitution of the Cosmos and the nature of things, that is religion to him—all this as the expression of an Infinite Soul that fills all the bounds of being. His life flows through all the world, in all its forms, giving it law and purpose. Harmony with this order, obedience to this law—seeing the divine through all forms, and having for it reverence and trust—this is religion, and the whole of it. On its human side it is identical with ethics, with loyal obedience to the laws of the Cosmos as expressions of divine truth. * * * Emerson has put the world immensely in his debt for his loyal and inspired interpretation of science, ethics, and religion as one, all resting on the same facts and laws."

According to the *Index*, the Massachusetts Bible Society listened while Rev. A. B. Jack spoke as follows:

"The Bible is God manifest in language. The syllabic presence of the Eternal is in the Bible. The vocal abiding of the Almighty is in the Bible. Language breathed from everlasting lips makes up the Bible. If it is *the* Word, it is of course all the Word. All Scripture—every sentence every syllable, every utterance—is given by inspiration of God. What a sublime conception . . . to think that what is now enshrined in syllables was once enshrined in God! If it is *the* Word, if it is all the Word, then it is an unimprovable Word. To alter the Scripture is to alter God."

So while science and modern thought are enlarging the idea of God, piety (so-called) belittles it, leaving Deity dependent on a mere Bible Society and at the mercy of the type-setters.

While Prof. Boardman, of the Congregational Theological Seminary, ridicules Herbert Spencer's "Data of Ethics," and says that his "system is the destruction of morals;" while President Porter, of Yale, with that sweetness of language which still survives among clergymen, notices the "grand and damning defect" of Spencer's theory; Prof. J. S. Jevons, the celebrated logician of England, says: "it is to Herbert Spencer we must look for a more

truthful philosophy of morals than was possible before this time." "To me," he says, the Spencerian philosophy 'presents itself in its main features, as unquestionably true." And not only true, but good and of religious value. Says Prof. Jevons:

"Evolution is a striving ever towards the better and the happier. There may be almost infinite powers against us, but at least there is a deep-laid scheme working towards goodness and happiness. So profound and wide-spread is this confederacy of the powers of good. that no failure and no series of failures can disconcert it. Let mankind be thrown back a hundred times, and a hundred times the better tendencies of evolution will re-assert themselves. Paley pointed out how many beautiful contrivances there are in the human form, tending to our benefit. Spencer has pointed out that the Universe is one deep-laid framework for the production of such beneficent contrivances. Paley called upon us to admire such exquisite inventions as a hand or an eye. Spencer calls upon us to admire a machine which is the most comprehensive of all machines, because it is ever engaged in inventing beneficial inventions *ad infinitum* * * * According to Mill, we are little self-dependent gods, fighting with a malignant and murderous power called Nature, sure, one would think, to be worsted in the struggle. According to Spencer, as I venture to interpret his theory, we are the latest manifestation of an all-prevailing tendency towards the good—the happy. Creation is not yet concluded, and there is no one of us who may not become conscious in his heart that he is no Automaton, no mere lump of Protoplasm, but the creature of a Creator."

TO FRIENDLY SUBSCRIBERS, ESPECIALLY MINISTERS.

The following circular with blanks, like that which will be found at the bottom of the last page of this paper, and attached by a perforated line, will be furnished free on application, to friends who will use them in obtaining subscriptions.

We respectfully suggest to Western Liberal Ministers that they have a "Unity Sunday," by distributing the little circular beforehand in the seats, preaching a sermon on what our great name or motto stands for, describing this little missionary called *Unity*, and then passing round the box to collect the filled out subscription blanks. In more than one place this plan has been tried with large and easy harvest Send for 20, 50, 100, or more of the circulars as you will.

[*Circular.*]

UNITY: An organ of "Freedom, Fellowship and Character in Religion." Published semi-monthly (16 pages) at 75 Madison Street, Chicago, Ills. One copy per year $1.50. Club Rate for Ten Copies, $1.25.

With March 1, 1880, UNITY begins the third year of its life. Its motto can be read above. That motto, and its name, tell what it tries to stand for,—the central unities of religious thought and feeling—that natural Religion of the soul which underlies the varying creeds of churches, and makes the several religions one. Whenever the central "Yes" implies a "No" to the common creeds or custom, its No, we trust, will never be unuttered or mistakable; but its aim is, first and last, to interpret and affirm the Yes. It believes in Freedom, but not in Freedom only; in Fellowship, but not in that alone; in Character, mightily, but not even in Character alone; but in *these three together*, in religion.

Its hope is to go about the land as a missionary of this faith and spirit; and specially to carry greeting, news, and solid thought on matters of this faith, among the scattered Liberals of the West.

If *you* believe that this is the true faith and spirit of religion, can you not strengthen it by yourself becoming a worker for UNITY? Subscribe for it. Show it to your neighbor of like, and not less to your neighbor of opposite spirit. Mail it to friends likely to welcome it on your introduction. If you can, get up a club to take it. And what you do, do *now*, if possible. Subscription blanks will be sent on application,

Publishing Committee, { ROBERT COLLYER. JENKIN LL. JONES, W. C. GANNETT, J. C. LEARNED, C. W. WENDTE.

NOTES FROM THE FIELD.

J. LL. J.

"What news abroad i' the world?"

BROOKFIELD, MASS.—H. H. Woude, of the Meadville Theological School, has been unanimously called to the First Congregational Church, of this place.

RIVER FALLS, WIS.—J. Ll. Jones conducted a missionary service at this place, on Sunday, Feb. 15th, to an audience of 300 people. It was the first public utterance of the Gospel of Unity ever heard in that place.

CONCORD, N. H.—Rev. E. L. Conger, who in previous years has done good work among the Universalists of the West, well known to some of the readers of *Unity*, is now the successful pastor of the Universalist church of this place.

COLDWATER, MICH.—The Liberals of this place are moving towards a permanent organization, and solicit the co-operation of such preachers or lecturers as may find it possible to give them a visit. Any such, passing through this vicinity, are requested to correspond with M. H. Parker, Esq.

UNITY SUNDAY.—As we go to press, reports begin to come in from the "Pillars of Unity" as to subscribers to our new volume. Last Sunday (Feb. 22d) was "Unity Sunday" at St. Paul, at which service, Mr. Gannett gathered his annual harvest of about half a hundred subscribers. The next best returns come from the invincible Blake, of Quincy, who lacks one of sending thirty. Who comes next?

NEW HAVEN, CONN.—Prof. Gray, the Botanist, has been lecturing on the "Antagonisms of Scientific and Theological Thought." The Theological Trigonometry of the popular creeds may fit poorly into the multiplication table, but there cannot be much conflict between the lilies and the golden rule. Daisies and the Beatitudes grow, for ought we can see, harmoniously together in the one Garden of God.

NEW YORK.—Felix Adler seems to have struck the golden mean in his estimate of Thomas Paine. In his commemorative address he showed how Paine affirmed and denied too much. Much of his condemnation of the Hebrew Bible sprung from want of the "Sense of historical distinction." Paine was an honest, and it may be a fair representative of the shallow philosophy of the 18th century rather than the profound criticism of the 19th.

SHELBYVILLE, ILL.—J. L. Douthit is to supply the pulpit of the revived Unitarian church at Mattoon, fortnightly, while his home work goes on apace, we should judge. A local editor having recently attended one of the socials at Douthit's church, was inclined to be a Unitarian because they mix declamations, music, and sandwiches and have such an idea of the Supreme Being, as would make it impossible to conceive of him as arbitrarily "thrusting poor sinners down the hatch-way of hell."

SANTA BARBARA, CAL.—Rev. F. G. Peabody, of Cambridge, Mass. writes to the *Christian Register* "The little Unitarian congregation here, begin their new meeting-house soon. A pluckier or a more loyal little company never represented rational religion. They are to meet in a bare room, without plaster, without carpet, without organ, but paid for so far as it is arranged and not to be a source of debt. In this *converted* shed, they have the possibility of a worthy building; and in themselves there are the elements of a a useful and permanent movement."

EASTER.—The Western Unitarian S. S. Society's Easter Festival Service is prepared this year by the Rev. Brooke Herford of Chicago and contains three pieces of music, with responsive services, readings for the minister, and a "Canticle of Commemoration." Mr. Herford has done his work with taste and tact, skilfully combining the thought of Christ with that of immortality. This with the "Easter" prepared last year by J. Vila Blake, a more elaborate service of eight pages with five pieces of music, gives a choice of service which can scarcely fail to satisfy the different phases of thought and taste among our liberal churches. Mr. Herford's service is furnished at the rate of $2.00 per 100 copies. Mr. Blake's $2.50 per 100 copies.

LA PORTE, IND.—A circular from this parish gives additional evidence of the growing tendency among living preachers to reduce their work into system, reaching after a greater coherency in the pulpit, also a greater recognition of the helpfulness of type. The following is Mr. Crooker's programme of services for the spring of 1880, reaching from March 7th, to May 23d:

1. *Short Studies in the Primitive Hebrew Religion.*—"The Legendary Background." "The Work of Moses." "The School of the Prophets." Current thoughts.

2. *Certain Preparations for Christianity.*—"The Jews at School in Babylon." "The School of the Rabbins." "The Influence of Greece." Current thoughts.

3. *The Home.*—"Its Importance," "Its Natural Elements." "Its Ethic Culture." Current thoughts.

The service named "Current Thought," will be devoted to a resume of able review articles, bearing on Liberal Religious Culture.

LAWRENCE, KANSAS.—The self-reliant persistency of the Liberal band at this place is a continual delight to the jotter. After hearing Rev. Mr. Howland for a month, they all very much wanted to set up a tabernacle for him, but when they found they could not always remain on the mount with him, with more grace than Peter, probably, they have unanimously consented to do the available thing, keep their pulpit open by lay services, which are well attended; maintain a Sunday School which averages fifty children and twenty adults, and this pastorless flock is actually thriving, and the cheerful word comes to us—"We will be a power yet." A few evenings ago they gave a home-made entertainment—"An evening with the Carey Sisters." This is feeding as well as entertaining the multitude. The $10.00 thus earned, shames too many dollars earned under the administration of preachers as the result of the stitchings of Ladies' Societies, or the dyspeptic fruit of of untimely suppers.

INDIA.—The Brahmo Somaj publishes a year book. The one for 1879, according to the *Unitarian Herald* gives an account of the marriage of a daughter of Keshub Chunder Sen, and a memorial service for Rahm Mohun Roy. The voices of these peophets of universal religion having once fallen on English ears, naturally suggest to us the large constituency in the far east, that are learning through this organization to emphasize Freedom, Fellowship and Character, as the essentials in religion.

EVANSVILLE, IND.—Rev. Geo. Chainey has been giving some wholesome advice to the working men of this city, which goes nearer the root of the matter, than the political economist is wont to go. He says: "Let the man who works with his hands, instead of giving his hours of rest to some senseless form, or repetition of exploded superstitions, lend his ears to those who know how to think, and there will be a marriage of strength to beauty, from which shall spring the children of health, comfort and joy.

* * * * * * *

"I pray you to consecrate your every endeavor to make perfect your relation with him who labors for you and all men with his brain. We need also to find out the right relations of the man who does not work, to him who does. All crime springs either from idleness or falshood.

* * * * * * *

"He, who will not work, must be compelled to do so, but with those wise and loving influences that will soon render them unnecessary. It can be done and will be done.

* * * * * * *

"Religion shall descend from the skies to take up its abode in the sweet love and lowly duties of all human hearts. The spasmodic effort to obtain the blessing of God with lip service shall pass away that the worship of work and love may prevail. The oath of the universe is pledged to the crowning of man as man. All things great or small must bow the knee to the divine life that has made his soul its temple."

MADISON, WIS.—Rev. H. M. Simmons lectured a few Sundays ago in the Opera House at this place, on "Capital Punishment," a subject being now agitated before the State Legislature. He was greeted with a large audience, and the daily papers published a full abstract of the discourse, Considering the Biblical argument, he admitted the severity of the older code, but claimed that it was not just to the Bible to make so much of its early statutes: for the Hebrew religion in its growth left its early barbarities behind—repealed them or read the harshness out of them. The Old Testament prophets stood for justice and mercy; and in the generation before Jesus. Rabbi Hillel and others preached the broadest humanity. The Jewish law in Jesus' time was very merciful to criminals—gave them every chance of escape and pardon; and the women of Jerusalem used to prepare for those condemned to die a narcotic drink to deaden consciousness, and make death as painless as possible. Jesus carried this spirit of mercy to an extreme degree, and in it disobeyed and denied the old Mosaic law. Instead of stoning the adulteress, he would not even condemn her, and his only re-

buke was, "Go and sin no more"; he quoted the law of retaliation from the Mosaic books, and expressly denied it; he blessed the merciful, and ordered to forgive an offender seventy times seven times. The Bible, as a whole, is not a harsh book. Its inhumanities are the old savage law which the Jewish nation outgrew. The Bible itself repeals them and shows us a nation and religion ever advancing in humanity and mercy. If it does not begin in barbarity and vengeance, it ends in the justice and mercy of the prophets, the divine tenderness of the Gospel, and the sweet, forgiving spirit of Jesus.

ST. LOUIS, MO.—The following is Mr. Snyder's apt address at the laying of the corner stone of the new edifice of the church of the Messiah, previously mentioned in these notes. The large work which this society has done in previous years, under the direction of Dr. Eliot, and the growing interest which *Unity* finds among these workers will make it acceptable reading to the many friends who expect that the future of this church will be worthy of its past:

"*Dear Friends*—We are about to place in position the corner-stone of our future spiritual homestead. It is a labor which symbolizes the faith and hope of the human heart; which gives a moment's solemn emphasis to the most precious qualities of religion, because it is an act which illustrates the soul's deep trust in the unseen forces to which we give the name of God. At present this temple has no existence, save in the mind of the master builder and the fervid hearts who long to enter into its courts with thanksgiving. The rude, shapeless materials from which the future grace and strength must spring, lie all about us in disorder, and yet we know that the trained brain that planned and the skillful hands that will build this church, are able to bring order out of chaos and beauty out of confusion. May it be a perpetual lesson written on imperishable stone, teaching us that from all the shames and confusions and moral chaos of the world the Divine Architect is slowly building society into the kingdom of heaven.

We shall watch the church grow, stone by stone, with something akin to the joy and satisfaction with which we see our children develope in strength and character. May it be to us, indeed, the "House of God." May its graceful spirit point with "unmoving finger" to the road our soul shall always be glad to take. May no mean ambition ever cross this threshold. May this door be wide enough to welcome every honest soul who loves the truth of God, and too narrow to admit the burden of one corroding care, one selfish thought, one unworthy feeling.

We intend that this unborn temple shall be a Christian church, and let us, in this solemn hour, join together in the sacred vow that the Christianity for which it stands shall mean at least freedom of mind, righteousness of life and an honest toleration for other men's convictions.

Believing, as we do, that no priestly finger could charm this temple and stone into sacredness, let us resolve to truly consecrate this place with the perpetual sacrament of holy living, and then when we bear our little ones across this threshold to the baptismal font, or see their glad feet keeping time to the merry marriage bells, or be called, with heavy hearts, to follow that casket that always holds our dearest earthly treasure, we can feel, indeed that the spot whereon we stand is "holy ground."

QUAKERS.—The *Friends' Intelligencer* of the 7th inst. records a movement among the Friends of Philadelphia to establish a regular teachers' meeting among workers in First-day schools. At the first meeting, among other questions, were discussed, How to secure punctuality; Instruction in primary classes; and the use of the black-boards in First-day schools, —the latter subject being so novel, that the committee were obliged to go outside the Society of Friends to find one competent to conduct the exercises. On the whole, the report says that it was demonstrated "that Friends can readily adapt themselves to an order of business that has limitation, and that such order is not inconsistent with the free, spontaneous expression of sentiment from those who have anything to offer," and that "it was quite encouraging to find how much could be said, and well said, on a given subject, when the speaker was obliged to condense into five minutes (the time allotted to each address)." All of which is instructive to those of us not always clothed in drab. The same paper contains an article on "The Rights of Children." We greatly respect the woman that can write, "I have often been pained by the want of respect for the personality and individuality of children. Even a baby should not be approached without hesitation. I have seen so much character in very young children that I felt that the formality of an introduction and gradual acquaintance were as necessary as with many older people. Indeed I have felt embarrassed in their presence, for they have seemed to have such decided character that I dare not intrude myself upon them without their permission." And lastly, the *Intelligencer* contains the following from the pen of one of the pillars of Unity:

HE THAT INHABITETH ETERNITY.

BY F. L. HOSMER.

Who does not feel how weak
Are all our words to speak
Of Him, the Infinite,
Below all depth, above all height!
Yet hath no other speech
To me such wondrous reach
As this the prophet saith: that He
Inhabiteth Eternity!

We dwell in Time: our ear
Is deafened by things near;
Darkly we see, and know
Only in part, also.
From troubles that annoy
Plucking no future joy;
Sweetening failure's bitterness
With no deferred but sure success,—
As if the passing hour were all,
With it we rise and fall:
The while that He
Inhabiteth Eternity!

Patient and suffering long
With man's mistakes and wrong;
Seeing how all threads come
In place in Time's vast loom,
And in the finished web fulfil
The pattern of His perfect will;
To whom as one is seen
What is, will be, hath been,—
Tranquil and lifted clear
Above our fevered atmosphere,
Forever dwelleth He

In the sure strength of His Eternity!

O Father of my life,
Give me, amid its strife,
To bear within my breast
The secret of Thy rest,—
The river of Thy peace within,
Whose banks are always fresh and green.
Give me, while here in Time I be,
Also to dwell with Thee in Thine Eternity.

WOMAN'S WORK.—Mrs. May Wright Thompson has been conducting a sharp controversy in *The Nation* concerning the possibilities of women in higher education, and its tendency towards their political enfranchisement. She quotes President Angell, of the Michigan University, who says: "I do not think that the women of the University have conspicuously failed in the study of history. Nor am I aware that they avoid it more than men. A large number of women are now pursuing that study with a success in no way inferior to the success of the men." From Mrs. T. we learn that there are fifty-three women now in this University.

Mrs. Martha N. McKay, of Indianapolis, has a paper on "Prison Reform" in the *Social Science Journal* for February, in which she earnestly and ably advocates the application of radical reform in the conduct of our prisons. She believes, and so do we, that "the picture which the great French novelist has drawn in 'Les Miserables' is not a sentimental impossibility. The spiritual growth of Jean Val Jean from the wretched galley slave into the serene and gentle helper of all who suffered, is but the story of awakened conscience, allowed to grow by giving and receiving love."

The same paper contains a portion of Kate N. Doggett's paper on "Art for Women," read before the last Woman's Congress. In this paper she says: "We cannot all pilgrim to temple and to tomb, cannot even visit the museums where statues, pictures and pottery are collected; but if we cannot go to them, the boon of multiplicative art can bring them to us. I would begin by establishing, wherever it is possible and as rapidly as it becomes possible, clubs for the study of art; would, with the little fund raised by individual contribution, purchase books, photographs, heliotypes, heliogravures, and, where means allow, the reproductions of the Arundel Society, engravings, casts, paintings."

Apropos with this subject, it may be interesting to know that Miss Fannie Priestly, great grand-daughter of Joseph Priestly, the early prophet of both science and liberal religion in England, has been wont to conduct regular Sunday services in the church founded by her forefather at Northumberland, Pa., for over a year, and directs a Sunday School of 160 pupils.

Mrs. Annie Diggs, of Lawrence, has been the preacher, for the last month, to the pastorless flock mentioned elsewhere in these notes.

Mrs. S. C. Ll. Jones occupied the pulpit of All Souls Church at Janesville, Wis., on the 15th inst., while the jotter was perambulating northward in the interests of Unity.

H. H. Barber has been lecturing before the Christian Union, Boston, on "Mary Carpenter, or Woman's Apostleship."

This much, notwithstanding the artificial and unjust barriers which are still in the way of woman's free exercise of her best powers. One serious class of obstacles is presented in the following communication from our Boston correspondent.

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR WOMAN.

K. G. W.

Though the doors of our colleges are fast opening to women, yet scholarships would be an immense help to many who with intellectual ability, yet lack the pecuniary means to pursue a collegiate course. Such help should never be rendered because of poverty alone, unless united with high attainments, proven satisfactorily to an examining corps. Harvard gives annually $25,000 to her students; Yale, $6,000. Dartmouth has 123 scholarships; Brown, 100. But Wellesley College, for girls, has only a Students' Aid Society, and three scholarships of $5,000 each. Yet there are in our New England colleges to-day, 538 girls, while there are 4,428 boys; and a large proportion of this difference in numbers is owing to a lack of pecuniary aid. Occasionally a girl's tuition bills are remitted by kind trustees, as at Smith, Colby and Wellesley; but generally a girl must eke out $200 from somewhere to pay her annual expenses, besides her bills for instruction, and in doing this her health is often impaired. Doubtless hard work in the struggle for education, as for everything else, strengthens the brain as well as the muscle; yet there seems to be no physiological reason why a girl's mind should not receive as much financial support as a boy's. There is a lady in Boston who for years has housed and fed collegians during their four years' course, doing all her own work, that she might have more to give to them. Will not some one do as much for girls?

The same disparity in numbers exists between the young men and women students at London University. 259 candidates, including nine women, passed its matriculative examination. The honor list numbered 61, of whom 6 were women, the other 3 of the original 9, prssed into the first class. At the second examination 526 men were successful, and 51 women, of whom 29 took honors, all the others being placed in the first class. This difference, however, is largely due to the fact that so many other admirable opportunities for pursueing the higher education exists in England for women. Oxford has now opened two halls to give to women, what for 10 years, has been offered them at Cambridge. King's College grants special diplomas to those, who for two years have followed a specified course of study. In Glasgow the University examinations will be open to all Scotland in May, and at Alexandra College, Dublin, 23 of the students obtained honor certificates on scholarships in March, last.

A Roman Catholic merchant in Australia has willed to a church £1000 "to secure the release of my soul from purgatory." The executor refuses to pay the money until he receives proof that the soul has been released from purgatory.

If any think the old theology is given up in the orthodox churches, the *Presbyterian* corrects the mistake. It says, replying to Phillips Brooks' assertion that preachers preach what they do not believe: "It is not true that the Deity of Christ is doubted among the evangelical ministry in this country. He cannot find a dozen such men in the five thousand of the Presbyterian ministry. He cannot find a greater proportion in the Methodist or Baptist ministry. It is not true that any portion of the evangelical ministry doubts the fact of Christ's vicarious death, and that the benefits of his atonement are made effective to the soul through repentance and faith. Nor is this true in regard to the everlasting punishment of the wicked, as the discussion of the subject in almost every pulpit of the land, incident upon Canon Farrar's vagaries, proved."

"UNITY" SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS.—SERIES IV.

THE GROWTH OF THE HEBREW RELIGION.

BY W. C. GANNETT.

Lesson 19.

RISE OF SECTS. THE PHARISEES.

Once more the nation, then, was free! Free with Priest-kings of its own,—the Maccabean princes. "Who but Jehovah could have done it? O, are we not his Chosen People!" was the grateful and triumphant thought. "And is this but the beginning? Will Jehovah now restore the ancient glory, call another David to the throne, and at last exalt his little people among the kingdoms of the earth?" That was the bright hope. Never before such pious Jews as now; such strict Sabbath-keeping;[53] so much Oral Law; such honor paid the Scribes. "For feasts and fasts, for tithes and sacrifices, for meats and drinks, for dress, furniture, dishes, for conversation, reading, travelling, meeting, parting, buying, selling, cooking, the washing of pots, cups, tables and person,"—for every smallest act[54] of life a "Thus saith Jehovah!" was discovered in the "Law."

Those who took especial pains to keep these rules and made parade of doing so were called the **Pharisees,** or "Separatists,"—the *Elect*, as we should say. They were the strict "church-members," whose name for the rest of the people was "the sinners," and whose heroes and ideals were the Scribes. These wore the large phylacteries and prayed long prayers in public places; and on the Sabbath, no, not an ass, they said, should wear its bell, because a bell was "burden," and to carry burdens was a "work," and work was Sabbath-breaking! These doted on the traditions of the Oral Law,—the more of them the better: and they had much to say about the Angels and the Resurrection and the Judgment after death. As believers in all this new light of doctrine and of ritual the Pharisees[55] were in one sense the Progressives of the day,—their orthodoxy daily grew more orthodox.

The Pharisees were the **National Party,** with by very far the greatest influence. They led the people both in politics and doctrine. The New Testament mentions them continually, coupling "Scribes and Pharisees" together. They were the men whom Jesus[60] called so boldly "Hypocrites! Blind Guides! Woe unto you!"—the men who dogged him with their half-earnest, half-cunning questions, and at last stirred up the people to demand his crucifixion. "Piety[61]" was an *art* with all of them; with the worse it was a *trade*. Yet there were **Noble Pharisees;**[62] and many, probably most, of the best men in the nation bore the name. As years went by, they gradually split into two schools, one very strict, the other somewhat more liberal; and mighty were their wrangles over next-to-nothings.

emphatically as from Jesus' lips, if we take Matt. vii. 12, xxii. 39 and Luke x. 29-37 together Jesus' very point was to enlarge the well-known Lev. xix. 18, by making "neighbor" include a despised and hated nation. The religions are characterized by the differing *emphasis* laid on certain virtues, but not a single great idea or virtuous ideal can be claimed as "original" by any one: for illustrations see T. W. Higginson's admirable tract on the "Sympathy of Religions," published by the Free Relig. Assoc., 231 Washington St., Boston; price, 10 cts.

Lesson 20.

THE SADDUCEES AND THE ESSENES.

But there was another party who called those other-world beliefs "new-fangled," and most of that Oral Law "mere nonsense,"—the **Sadducees.**[56] The genuine old Moses' men, these claimed to be; his written Law was good enough for them! In the existing drift of things they were, of course, the Conservatives; and yet as their very conservatism made them less Jewish and more hospitable to foreign ways, they appeared as Liberals or Broad Churchmen. Men of the world and wealthy, these; the old "first families" of Jerusalem; the Court-circle, much too fashionable to be popular; "cultured and cold-blooded aristocrats." That these unorthodox Sadducees were also identified with the Temple-circle and that the High Priest was usually their man, and not a Pharisee, shows how far the household ritual of the "Law" had gradually *out-ritualed* the Temple. Judaism, we can see, was getting ready to live without its Temple.

Still a third sect rose, called the **Essenes.**[57] These were the Quakers or the Shakers, the "Come-outers," of the time. A queer folk, living in little communities in out-of-the-way places, sharing their property and meals and work; very honest, frugal, industrious and peaceful; great Sabbath-keepers and great Baptizers, with holy shudders for the slightest ceremonial uncleanness,—Jews of the Jews in this respect. They sent gifts, but no animal sacrifices, up to the Temple; were vegetarians and tee-totallers, and the strictest of them never married. The oath they took on entering the Society was to be truthful, just, obedient, to hate the bad and help the good, and injure no man even on compulsion; and after that they never took oath more. They claimed to know the secret of the angel-names, and by them to work spells and cast out devils.

If the Pharisees were the legal, and the Sadducees the priestly, the Essenes were the prophet-like, Jews: or,—again speaking roughly,—we might call them respectively the *Ritualists*,[58] the *Rationalists*, and the *Ascetics*, of their day. In the New Testament we seldom meet the Sadducees, and never the Essenes,—at least never by that name. But quite possibly John the Baptist had been an Essene, and Jesus would have been likely to know some of them well. They were the only party with which he had much in common, and even from their ascetic ways he differed widely.[59]

Read "Pharisees and Sadducees," Acts xxiii. 1-10.
"An Essene (?) Prophet," Luke iii. 2-14.

The most famous leader of the liberal school was a Scribe named **Hillel,**[63] who died an old man when Jesus was a little boy. He reduced the explanation of the "Law" to a kind of science having seven rules, and his wise and gentle sayings were much treasured. They tell this story of him: One day a man came to Shammai,—he was the head of the rival, stricter school,—saying "Rabbi, teach me the whole Law while I stand upon one foot." The angry master drove him off with blows. He went to Hillel with his question, and Hillel answered, "Do not to thy neighbor what thou wouldst not have thy neighbor[64] do to thee. This is the whole Law: all the rest is commentary." And yet this same Hillel held that "none of your common people can be pious." What wonder, when he taught that no pious Jew would eat an egg laid on the Sabbath day, if laid by a hen *kept* to lay eggs! That shows what even the worthiest and most liberal Pharisees were like when Jesus was a school-boy.

Read "Jesus Silencing the Pharisees and Sadducees," Matt. xxii. 15-46.
"Cups and Pots and Brazen Vessels,' Mark vii 1-13.
"Two Prayers," Luke xviii. 9-14.

53. Sabbath-keeping: E. g., see 1 Mac. ii. 31-41; vi. 49. "The Egg Laid on a Festival" is the name of the Talmud's treatise about works allowed on Holy Days. A legal Sabbath-day's journey was only 2,000 cubits. But various cunning devices were also legalized to get around these rules. (See note 55.) And, in fact, the Jewish Sabbath appears to have been not the grim day but the cheer-day of the week. Is a rest-day without cheer holier than a rest-day with it? Then what home-rules for Sunday should you think wise? But are the same things "cheer" to all? Then what Sunday *laws* should you think just?——**54. Smallest act:** See Geikie's "Life of Christ," vol. I., 243-258,—the astonishing chapter called "Life under the Law."——**55. Pharisees:** See Stanley's "Jewish Church," vol. III., 419-422. "Pharisee" was the name of the *party;* within the party, "Scribes" (also called lawyers and doctors in the N. T.) were those who made the Mosaic Law a *profession;* among the Scribes, "Rabbi" or "Master" was a title of individual honor: all of them familiar N. T. words. For *phylacteries*, see Matt. xxiii. 5, and Part II., note 23, above. For *prayers*, etc., Matt. vi. 1-7, 16-18; Luke xviii. 9-14. For *Sabbath-keeping*, see Farrar's "Life of Christ," vol. I., 432; II., 471-4. For *traditions*, Mark vii. 1-23. *Resurrection*, Acts xxiii. 6-9.——**60. Jesus** is best understood when seen against a background of Pharisees, and thus the Gospel-pictures constantly show him. He then appears as the religious Radical ever denouncing the formal orthodoxies of his day, ever announcing a deeper morality, a simpler trust, a more real worship. For his ideal of *true Judaism* in contrast with theirs, see Matt. v. 17 to vi. 18. For his clash with their *Sabbath-keeping*, Matt. xii. 1-14. His clash with their *good-company* proprieties, Matt. ix. 10-13. His clash with their *dinner-table* rules, Mark vii. 1-8. For the *dogging*, Matt. xxii. For his "*Woes*," Matt. xxiii. And for all, see Farrar's "Life of Christ," vol. I., 421-449; II, 226-251 What think you of his denunciations? Was Jesus nothing but a dove? Is there a righteous indignation? a righteous scorn? If the sweep of his wrath made him unjust, (compare our abolitionists,) yet as the victim of the Pharisees he did not forget to be just to them. (Luke xxiii. 34.)——**61. Piety an art:** See Farrar's "Life of Christ," vol. II., 471-4; and II. 248, for the six classes of unworthy Pharisees ridiculed by the Talmud itself. Why has "piety" its bad name? Is it good things or bad that are travestied and forged? Do "church-member rogues" tell most against, or really most *for*, the churches? Was Jesus "pious?" What are pious words? and pious deeds? Is 1 Thess. v. 17-18, impossible if 1 Cor. x. 31 explains it?——**62. Noble Pharisees:** e. g., Paul. See Acts v. 34-39; xxii. 3; xxvi. 5; Mark xii. 28-34.——**63. Hillel:** For the two schools, see Stanley, vol. III., 425, 497; and for specimens of their disputation, 501-3. For Hillel, see Stanley, III., 499-509, and Farrar's "Life of Christ," II., 453-60.——**64. Neighbor:** See Lev. xix. 18, and Tobit iv. 15. Essentially the same maxim reaches us from still earlier times and other religions,—from Confucius, Buddha, Socrates ando thers; but perhaps from no one quite so distinctly and

56. The Sadducees: The "Just," or perhaps simply "Zadok's men." See Stanley, vol. III., 423, 434; but better, Farrar's "Life of Christ," vol. II., 494-8. For Jesus and the Sadducees, Matt xxii. 23-33.——**57. Essenes:** Their name and origin a mystery. See Stanley, vol. III., 424, 438, 438, 510-5.——**58. Ritualists, etc.** (1) Who are *to-day's* Pharisees? All *hot formalists* in religion, who insist overmuch on either rites or beliefs in religion, confounding these with moral duties. Are there no good Pharisees, then? no free-thinking Pharisees? Are all, bigots? (2) Who are to-day's Sadducees? All *cold* formalists. Is "culture" necessarily rationalistic? necessarily cold-blooded? Why is it so apt to be in love with "institutions?" What *is* "culture?" (3) Who are to-day's Essenes? Did you ever visit a Shaker settlement or a Roman Catholic nunnery? Is asceticism good worship? Speak of the *fakirs* and the early Christian ascetics. May not secret self-denials of bodily pleasure help to strengthen will and character?——**59. Differed widely:** Jesus and the Essenes,—what resemblances, what differences, between them?

Edward Eggleston, in *Scribner's Monthly*, makes the following criticism on Sunday School work: "Too much attention to dogmatic questions and too little to questions of conduct; too much bondage to Bible teachings and too little devotion to the production of Christian character; too much superficial revivalistic work and too little broad philanthropic endeavor; too much preparatory lesson-hearing and too little of the affectionate, life-long attachment of god-parent and god-child; too much system and too little common sense; too much memory and too little sympathy."

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

Under this head we will hereafter notice all books, pamphlets, and magazines received at this office from publishers, with price and such editorial comment as our space will admit; thus giving to publishers an advertising medium which will introduce their Liberal and Progressive publications to the most appreciative class of readers.

Any publications noticed in this column can be ordered from this office.

Unity Pulpit. By M. J. Savage. Nos. 16 to 19. Published by Geo. H. Ellis, 101 Milk street, Boston. Price 6 cents; single copies $1.50 per year.

Sermons. By John W. Chadwick. January and February, 1880. Published by James Miller, 779 Broadway, N. Y.

Good Times. For February. Mrs. M. B. C. Slade, editor. Published by T. W. Bicknell, 16 Hawley street, Boston. Replete with good material for Easter festivals.

The Children's Hour. A collection of dialogues, speeches, motion songs, etc, for all seasons and occasions by the above editor. Published by Henry A. Young & Co.

The Manhood of Jesus and the Holy Spirit. Two discourses by Rev. C. J. K. Jones, acting pastor of the Church of the Messiah. Louisville, Ky. A healthful discussion of these topics in a pamphlet of eighteen pages.

The *Christian Register* says: "With characteristic agility the Western liberalism steps in advance of the Eastern;" and besides the union services with Jews we have already reported, notices the following: "Some years back, when Mr. Vickers was a Unitarian pastor in Cincinnati, he preached on a Sunday for Rabbi Wise; last year Rev. J. Vila Blake preached for Rabbi Moses in Quincy, Ill.; and Rabbi Lilienthal preached, a few months ago, for Mr. Wendte, in Cincinnati."

UNITY.

Published semi-monthly at 75 Madison St., Chicago.

Editor, H. M. SIMMONS.
Business Agent, F. L. ROBERTS.

Publishing Committee. { ROBERT COLLYER, W. C. GANNETT, JENK. LL. JONES, C. W. WENDTE, J. C. LEARNED.

TERMS:

One copy, per year $1 50
Ten copies, or more, each..... 1 25
Single Copies 07

Send money by Registered Letter, P. O. Order, or Draft on Chicago Bank. Drafts, however small, on Banks outside of Chicago, are liable to a charge of 25 cents for cashing.

Address all money and business letters to the office. All editorial communications to H. M. Simmons, Madison, Wis.

RECEIPTS.

Mary C. Duhme, $1.50; O. Follett, $1.50; Isaac Hyde, Jr., $1.50; Robert E. Guilford, $1.25; Mrs. Josephine E. Cochran, $1.25; Thomas P. C. Lane, $1.25; George A. Follansbee, $1.50; E. C. Jones, $2.50; Mrs. A. M. Claflin, $1.50; Mrs. C. V. Guy, $1.50; Miss Rosalie Hatherwell, $1.50; Miss Laura Crane, $1.25; Rev. J. T. Lusk, $3 00; Mrs. A. O. Tyler, $1.50; Mrs. Anne Ryland, $1.50; Mrs. H. Wilde, $1.50; Dr. Jos. Robbins, $1.50; Mr. Geo. Wolcott, $1.50; Miss M. A. P. Smith, $1.50; Mrs. S. S. Powers, $1.50; Mrs. Julia Eaton, $1.50; Mrs. H. P. Harris, $1.50; Mrs. Geo. G. Wright, $1.50; Mr. Joel P. Davis, $1.50; Mr. E. A. Ayerst, $1.50; R. J. Greenman, $1.50; James L. Quirk, $1.50; Daniel Wood, $1.50; A. D. Frink, $1.50.

ANTIOCH COLLEGE,

Yellow Springs, Green Co., Ohio, offers to both sexes thorough instruction, preparatory and collegiate, by an experienced faculty of five professors, in ancient and modern languages, mathematics, the natural and the moral sciences, and literature. Special attention will be given to fitting young men for Harvard or Yale in a three-years course. The College is situated in a quiet, beautiful and healthful village, is provided with all necessary buildings and apparatus, and has for its regular preacher a Unitarian minister, thus securing liberal religious services to all who desire to attend them. Total expenses for the year from $150 to $200. Address for catalogue or further information, S. C. DERBY, President.

WESTERN UNITARIAN HEADQUARTERS,
75 Madison Street.

FRANCES L. ROBERTS, SUPERINTENDENT.

WESTERN UNITARIAN CONFERENCE.

BASIS OF FELLOWSHIP.

WHEREAS, We feel the great need of rallying the Liberal minds of the West around one common centre; therefore,

Resolved, That the Western Unitarian Conference conditions its fellowship on no dogmatic tests, but welcomes all thereto who desire to work with it in advancing the Kingdom of God. (Adopted at Chicago, May 14, 1875.)

ST. LOUIS, Mo., Feb. 18, 1880.

Editor of Unity:—Dear Sir—Please acknowledge since last report, a contribution to Western Unitarian Conference, Feb. 18th, from Unity Church of Cincinnati, per Rev. C. W. Wendte, $125. Feb. 15, collected at River Falls, Wis., $10.00; Feb. 15, from a friend in River Falls, $5.

Yours truly, JOSEPH SHIPPEN, Treas.

EASTER.

The Western Unitarian Sunday School Society, 75 Madison St., Chicago, has published two special services for that day.

No. 1, EASTER, by Rev. Vila Blake, 8 pp., containing five carols, responsive readings, refrains, &c. Published 1879. $2.50 per 100 copies.

No. 2, EASTER FESTIVAL SERVICE, by Rev. Brooke Herford, 4 pp., containing three pieces of music, responsive service, a Canticle of commemoration, &c. $2.00 per 100 copies.

BOARD AND INSTRUCTION IN A PRIVATE FAMILY IN GERMANY.

A few young ladies or children will be received into a private family residing at Weinheim, Baden, Germany. This quaint little town is healthily and charmingly situated on the Bergstrasse at the foot of the Odenwald range, and within a short ride of Heidelberg, Carlsruhe, Worms, Darmstadt, Frankfort, and other German cities. The house is just without the town walls, is large, surrounded by pleasant grounds, and commanding fine views of the Rhine plain and the mountains. The family are conversant with English. The German spoken in the house is Hanoverian. Instruction is given in the family and may be supplemented by the best masters from Heidelberg and other cities, who visit the town twice a week to give lessons in music, drawing, etc. The celebrated Bender Institute for boys is also located in Weinheim. Total expenses for board and tuition from $350 to $450 per annum, according to number of extra studies pursued. For particulars, address REV. C. W. WENDTE,
196 Auburn-St., Cincinnati, O.

REFERENCES BY PERMISSION:

Madame Jane Wendte, Cincinnati.
Rev. Wm. H. Fish, Jr., Troy, N. Y.
Miss F. E. Case, 1334 Spruce-St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. Clay McAuley, Washington D. C.
Rev. Francis Tiffany, West Newton, Mass.

N. B.--HAS NOT YOUR SUBSCRIPTION EXPIRED?

The subscription to *Unity* expired for many of our subscribers, with the Feb. 15th number,—the present number, March 1, begining a new year. All subscribers who wish to continue on the list will please forward their names promptly to this office, using, if they please the blank printed below.

UNITY Office, 75 Madison-St., Chicago, Ill.:

*Please send*_____*copy (copies) of UNITY form March 1, 1880, to February 15, 1881, to*

(Name,)_____

(Address,)_____

*Enclosed find $*_____

Entered at the Post Office at Chicago as second class matter.